

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                     | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/117,380                          | 01/27/1999    | MATITYAHU FRIDKIN       | FRIDKIN=1           | 3626             |  |
| 75                                  | 90 12/06/2001 |                         |                     |                  |  |
| BROWDY & NEIMARK                    |               |                         | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| 624 NINTH STREET, N.W.<br>SUITE 300 |               |                         | HUTSON, R           | N, RICHARD G     |  |
| WASHINGTO                           | N, DC 20001   |                         | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|                                     |               |                         | 1652                | $\gamma \gamma$  |  |
|                                     |               | DATE MAILED: 12/06/2001 |                     |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| *.   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/117,380  | FRIDKIN ET AL.   |   |  |  |  |
| navicely nation  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |   |  |  |  |
|  | Richard G Hutson  | 1652   |   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2001 FAILS TO PLAC<br>Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave<br>final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1)<br>condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea<br>Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | roid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which<br>I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely  | ation. A proper reply<br>n places the applica  | y to a<br>ation in  |  |  |  |
|  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejecti<br>HE FINAL REJECTION.<br>R 1.136(a) and the appr<br>unt of the fee. The appr<br>originally set in the final | on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF   | •   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:   |  |   |  |  |  |
| (a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s   | see NOTE below);   | -   |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b   | elow);  |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | n better form for appeal by mate  | rially reducing or sir   | mplifying the   |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti  | on(s):  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se   | eparate, timely filed  | amendment   |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY t  | o issues which were  | e newly   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |   |  | and an  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>5-8</u> .   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,9,12 and 13</u> .  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | a) approved or b) disapp  | roved by the Exami   | iner.   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer   | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| $\smile$   |   |  |   |  |  |  |



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicants proposed amendment after-final would raise additional 112 2nd issues such as the metes and bounds of those molecules which are encompassed by a "peptide but not an entire protein". Further the proposed amendment would require additional search such that the claimed genus would be changed. Further still, it is pointed out that Barr et al. clearly teaches fragments of the alpha-1-antitrypsin protein wherein said fragment is not more than 200 amino acids and includes the active site which would include the claimed peptides (See column 2, lines 42-55).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants traversal of the finality of the previous office action (Paper No. 19, 8/21/2001) is not found persuasive, because it is clear that the new grouds of rejection if presented in response to applicants amendment (amendment b, 12/12/2000) upon which it was based clearly would have been proper. Based on applicants subsequent submission, which necessitated the additional grounds of rejection, the finality of the previous office action was removed and the current office action made final. After discussion with a number of primary examiners as well as supervisory examiners the finality of the current office action is maintained.

REBECCA E. PROUTY PRIMARY EXAMINER

PONNATHAPUACHUT MURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CONTER 1600